

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed September 26, 2006, the Examiner noted that claims 1-23 were pending and rejected claims 1-23. New claim 24 has been added, claim 10 has been cancelled and claims 1, and 11 - 13 have been amended. Thus, in view of the forgoing, claims 1-9 and 11-24 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

Non-Prior Art Rejections

The Office Action on page 2 rejected claims 1-12 under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112. In rejecting claims 1-12, the Office Action did not address why independent claims 7, 9 and 10 were rejected under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112. Therefore it is submitted that the rejections of claims 7-12 was improper and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Furthermore, It is submitted that claims 1-6, amended, complies with 35 U.S.C. § 112. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Prior Art Rejections

The Office Action on pages 2-4 rejection claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Buxton (6,115,025). The method of claim 1 clearly recites "A graphical user interface displayed on a display and comprising a first part and a second part" at lines 1-2. Thus, the present application is directed to a graphical user interface with two interface parts, shown, for example, in Fig. 1 by the reference numeral 22 and 28. In contrast, Figs. 3a and 3b of Buxton do not show a graphical user interface with a first part and a second part but rather show a single part interface. Buxton describes the reference numerals in Figs. 3a and 3b as "[t]he model 34 turns with the display 32 while the interface element 30 remains aligned with the normal viewing" in column 4, lines 37-39. Therefore, model 34 cannot be considered part of the graphical user interface as the Office Action alleges on page 3, line 3.

In view of the above, it is submitted that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. Likewise, dependent claims 2-6 depend on claim 1 and it is submitted that claims 2-12 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art.

Independent method claim 7 recites "interaction with one or more interface elements ... interaction with another element of the user interface" at lines 3-6. It is submitted that claim 7 is

directed to more than one interface element. Therefore, it is submitted that claim 7 and dependent claim 8 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Independent method claim 9 recites "an element of the user interface to the user, where another element of the user interface" at lines 2-3. Clearly claim 9 is directed to more than one user interface element. Therefore, it is submitted that claim 9 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art.

Independent method claim 11 currently recites multiple interface elements ("an element of the user interface ... another element of the user interface"). Clearly claim 11 is directed to more than one user interface element. Therefore, it is submitted that claim 12 and dependent claim 12 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art.

Independent method claim 13 recites "a method of orienting elements of a user interface" where the method "automatically orienting one of the elements of the user interface relative to the determined user". The Office Action cited "[I]t is the further object of the present invention to detect the orientation of plural users" in column 3, lines 4-5 of Buxton as anticipated claim 13. Thus, the prior art refers to a plurality of *users*, not a plurality of *elements*. Therefore, it is submitted that claim 13 and dependent claims 14-17 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art.

Independent method claim 18 recites "interaction with one or more interface elements ... interaction with another element of the user interface" at lines 3-7. It is submitted that claim 18 is directed to more than one interface element. Therefore, it is submitted that claim 18 and dependent claim 19 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art.

Independent apparatus claim 20 recites "a user interface element ... with another user interface element" at lines 1-7. Clearly claim 20 is directed to more than one user interface element and it is submitted that claim 20 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art.

Independent apparatus claim 21 recites "allowing one or more interface elements to change in orientation ... while one or more other interface elements remain in a fixed orientation" at lines 1-4. Clearly, claim 21 is directed to more than one user interface element and it is submitted that claim 21 and dependent claim 22 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art.

Independent claim 23 recites "a first interface element and a second interface element" at lines 1-2. Clearly, claim 23 is directed to more than one interface element and it is submitted that claim 23 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art.

Dependent Claims

The dependent claims, as discussed above, depend from the above-discussed independent claims and are patentable over the prior art for the reasons discussed above. The dependent claims also recite additional features not taught or suggested by the prior art. For example, claim 5 emphasizes a change to the orientation/location information for the interface part is determined automatically based on a spatial orientation/location change relative to the display. The prior art does teach or suggest such. It is submitted that the dependent claims are independently patentable over the prior art.

New Claim

New claim 24 emphasizes automatically orienting first interface part and retaining the second interface part in a same orientation. Nothing in the prior art teaches or suggests such. It is submitted that this new claim, which is different and not narrower than prior filed claims distinguishes over the prior art.

Summary

It is submitted that the claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112. It is further submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: January 11, 2007

By: J. Randall Beckers/
J. Randall Beckers
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501